

DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004

| APPLICATION NO.           | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/655,102                | 09/05/2000      | Ki Hyun Joo          | EXIO-002 7284       |                  |
|                           | 7590 11/19/2004 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| BARTON E. SHOWALTER, ESQ. |                 |                      | PHUNKULH, BOB A     |                  |
| BAKER & BO                | OTTS, LLP       |                      |                     |                  |
| 2001 ROSS AVENUE          |                 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| SUITE 600                 |                 |                      | 2661                |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |                                       |  |  |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/655,102  | JOO ET AL.   |                                       |  |  |
| Advisory Notion   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |                                       |  |  |
|   | Bob A. Phunkulh   | 2661   |                                       |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence addre  | ess                                   |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 28 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | oid abandonment of this applica<br>a timely filed amendment which   | ation. A proper reply<br>n places the applicati            | to a<br>ion in                        |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| <ul> <li>a)</li></ul>   | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth<br>ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH             | g date of the final rejection<br>IE FINAL REJECTION. S     | n.<br>See MPEP                        |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | If extension and the corresponding amo<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>be later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The appro<br>originally set in the final O | priate extension<br>Office action; or |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:   |  |                                       |  |  |
| (a)   they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (s   | see NOTE below);   |                                       |  |  |
| (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b   | elow);  |  |                                       |  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:  | ng a corresponding number of fi   | nally rejected claims                                      |                                       |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | ion(s):   |  |                                       |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se   | eparate, timely filed a                                    | mendment                              |  |  |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See  |   | dered but does NOT   | place the                             |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY t  | o issues which were  | newly                                 |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |   |  | nd an                                 |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>1 and 3-8</u> .  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-30</u> .  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr   | oved or b) disapproved by the   | he Examiner.   |                                       |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |   | Be AT  | m                                     |  |  |
|   |   | BOB PHUNKULH<br>RIMARY EXAMINER                            |                                       |  |  |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Han (US 6,714,785) discloses determining the the handoff request based on the combination of location flag (see col. 8 lines 58-65); and executing the handoff based on the combination of location flag and direction flag, traveling toward adjacent base station (see col. 9 lines 8-18). The handoff request is cancelled based on the combination of location flag and the direction flag, traveling away from the adjacent base station (see figrue 9 steps 915, 917, 919).